Professionalism of News Workers:
The Creation and Evolution of the Concept

by

Lee B. Becker
Tudor Vlad
Edward M. Gans
Heidi Hatfield Edwards
George L. Daniels
Namkee Park*

James M. Cox Jr. Center for International Mass Communication Training and Research
Henry W. Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

February 2003

The autumn 1964 issue of *Journalism Quarterly* contained an 11-page article titled simply: Professionalization Among Newsmen.

The article, authored by Jack M. McLeod, then an assistant professor and associate director of the Mass Communication Research Center (MCRC), and his master's student, Searle E. Hawley Jr., drew upon the contemporary literature of the sociology of work and occupations as well as what the authors termed "communicator" studies to create a new concept for the field of mass communication: the degree of professional orientation of journalists.

McLeod and Hawley used a methodology and several specific items from work at the University of Michigan, where McLeod earned his doctorate, to create an index of professional orientation among news workers that is still heavily cited and used today, more than 35 years later.[1] As the analysis by McLeod, Zubric and Boyle in Chapter 14 of this book shows, this work has been extensively cited in the communication field, where it has shaped much of the discussion of professionalism.

The McLeod and Hawley concept is at the level of the individual, but it draws on the sociological literature at the level of occupations and is influenced by the thinking in sociology about professions at that time.

This chapter looks at the evolution of the concept *degree of professionalism* of news workers in the field of mass communication from the publication of the McLeod and Hawley piece in 1964 until today. It reviews key studies using the *degree of professionalism* concept–and often the McLeod and Hawley measures–and attempts to offer generalizations about the findings. *Degree of professionalism* is used in the paper, rather than the McLeod and Hawley term, degree of professional orientation, for reasons that will be explained below.

---

[1]The February 2001 issue of *Journalism Studies* contains an article citing the McLeod and Hawley article. See Peter Johansen (2001). The 1998 volume, *Global Journalist,* contained two references to McLeod and Hawley. See Weaver (1998).

This text also looks at the evolution of sociological thinking about occupations and contrasts the ways in which professions are viewed in the sociological literature today with the way they were viewed 35 years ago.

The article concludes with some evaluative comments about the concept of *degree of professionalism* of communication professionals and some suggestions for the future. Specifically, the paper suggests that more attention should be paid to the theoretical linkages between degree of professionalism as measured by McLeod and his students and the consequences of this orientation.

The Origins of the Wisconsin Research Program on Professionalism

The McLeod and Hawley article in *Journalism Quarterly* was the first in a series of publications by McLeod and his former students making a linkage between journalism and the sociological literature on professions and the professionalization of occupations. The McLeod and Hawley article, in fact, begins by observing: "A recurring journalistic controversy has involved the question whether journalism is a true profession or merely a craft."

McLeod and Hawley do not concern themselves directly with this issue of the status of the journalistic occupation vis-à-vis the professional model of occupations existing in sociology at the time. Rather, they ask if "it really makes a difference how much a journalist sees himself as a professional."[2] While they say the "consensus seems to be that it does, in fact, make a difference," they argue that the evidence for this is limited. They cite Warren Breed's (1955) now classic piece in *Social Forces* on social control in the newsroom and Rodney Stark's (1962) less well known piece in *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* on the organizational analysis of a metropolitan newspaper as offering limited support.[3]

Breed, noted McLeod and Hawley, found that technical and ethical norms among the journalists he studied served as deterrents to carrying out publishers' policies. Stark classified his journalists as

---

[2]McLeod and Hawley, in the article's title and elsewhere, refer to journalists as men. This was probably largely, though clearly not entirely, an accurate classification at the time.

[3]As an aside, it seems worth mentioning that the article following Stark's study about metropolitan journalism in the *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* was titled "The Professional Prostitute."

either "professional" or "local" and found that the former were more competent and more resistant to policy.

While a concern with the consequences of professionalism among journalists was clearly at the center of McLeod and Hawley's article, they also were interested in offering a "precise definition of the professional orientation of the journalist" as well as identifying a way "to measure such an orientation" (p. 529). The existing "communicator" studies did not provide either, they argued.[4]

McLeod and Hawley cited sociological work to support their conceptualization. Included was a study by Lieberman (1956) of education, which identified the characteristics of occupations that have become professions. They cited the sociological work by Carr-Saunders and Wilson (1933a), Greenwood (1957), Hughes (1963), Kramer (1955) and Wilensky (1962, 1964) to identify the characteristics of workers who have a professional orientation. This literature, McLeod and Hawley argued, suggested that a "professional person" is one who places "heavy emphasis on service, intellectual activity, autonomy and influence" (p. 530).

While the base for McLeod and Hawley's conceptual definition of a professional orientation was the literature of the sociology of work, the operational referent was a study by Marvick (1954) of the career interests of American civil servants.[5] Marvick draws on the sociological literature on bureaucratic settings, rather than the sociological work on professions and professionalization, and distinguishes between lay positions and expert positions in those bureaucracies. The former are filled by people with "merely enough knowledge to perform prescribed operations, to know the rules and the proper timing, and to know where to go in case of doubt" (p. 14). Expert positions, in contrast, are filled by "persons who are professionally trained and disciplined before coming to the organization" (p. 15). This distinction leads Marvick to identify three types of career perspectives in organizations. Some individuals are

---

[4]McLeod and Hawley use the term "communicator" to refer to this tradition of studying the work of journalists and put the term in quotes. The term is now common in the field, though it isn't clear how common it was at that time.

[5]Marvick's article was published in a serial called *Michigan Government Studies* at the University of Michigan. In the Preface to the volume, Marvick indicates that the monograph was prepared while he was at the Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. McLeod later was an assistant study director in the Survey Research Center.

institutionalists, i.e., committed to a career in a given institution, and some are specialists, committed to a career in a profession, and some combine both of these commitments. Marvick used 16 items in an effort to determine if these three groups of individuals showed "differences in value-emphases" that they attached "to various factors important in a job." As expected, specialists (professionals) rated a number of characteristics of job, such as "opportunity to learn," "full use of abilities," and "working with new ideas" more highly than did institutionalists. The latter, in contrast, rated "salary," "being sure a job is permanent," and "being able to make important decisions" as more important than did the specialists.

McLeod and Hawley adapted the Marvick approach in developing their measure of professional orientation. They identified 24 potential types of satisfaction that could be obtained from a job. None of these were taken directly from Marvick, though several are similar. Half of these 24 types of satisfaction were identified as "professional" items, and half were identified as "non-professional" in nature. For example, satisfaction obtained from "having a job that is valuable and essential to the community" was considered to be "professional" in nature, while satisfaction obtained from "being with people who are congenial and easy to work with" was considered to be "non-professional." Satisfaction resulting from "having a job with a paper that is known and respected by journalists all over the United States" was considered "professional." Satisfaction obtained from having a "job that does not disrupt my family life" was considered "non-professional." These items are shown in Table 1.

_____

Table 1 about here

_____

The McLeod and Hawley items were to be introduced to respondents as follows: "People look for different things in their occupations which make their work satisfying to them." The respondents were to indicate how important each potential source of satisfaction was to them in assessing a job. McLeod and Hawley proposed summing responses to the 12 "professional" items and subtracting from this total the sum of the responses to the 12 "non-professional" items to create a score on professional orientation for each respondent.

To validate their measure of professional orientation as well as to test their expectations about the consequences of this orientation, McLeod and Hawley used data gathered at two Milwaukee newspapers, The *Milwaukee Journal* and the *Milwaukee Sentinel*. A total of 115 journalists and 93 advertising sales personnel, circulation managers, business supervisors and clerical employees from the two papers completed the survey.[6] The validation consisted of correlating each item against the total index (minus the individual item), examining the results of a factor analysis of responses to the items, and contrasting the responses of editorial and non-editorial respondents of the two papers to the items. Individual items correlated as expected with the overall index. The factors that emerged were consistent with the a priori classification. Journalists who responded to the survey scored higher on the index than did the non-editorial respondents.

Although the McLeod and Hawley article is cited most often in a methodological context, and the measure they developed has been used extensively throughout the world, as the review that follows shows, it clearly was not the intent of the authors to present solely a methodological treatise. Drawing on the sociology of occupations literature, they argued that a person with a professional orientation "will differ in overt behavior and in cognitive judgement" from a person without this orientation (p. 530). Specifically, they argued that a "more professionally oriented newsman" would use "dimensions of judgment–or frames of reference–that would differentiate them" from less professional journalists and would have differing positions along the "dimensions of judgment" and "greater within-group agreement or homogeneity of position" than would less professional journalists. They also expected the more professionally oriented journalists to "be more in favor of implementing professional values" and "more critical of the newspaper for which they work."

Indeed, the results of this initial study by McLeod and Hawley showed differences among three groups: the more professionally oriented journalists (those above the median on the index), the less

---

[6]The authors attempted a census of journalists at the two papers and a sample of non-editorial employees and reported a return rate of "approximately two-third." An unpublished report written by McLeod and Hawley in 1965, possibly for the newspapers themselves, indicates that the questionnaire was "sent" to the editorial staffs of the two papers and to a randomly selected sample of the advertising, circulation, business and clerical employees. The *Journalism Quarterly* piece refers to the sample as "systematic." Probably it was a systematic probability sample.

professionally oriented journalists (those below the median on the index), and the non-editorial

employees. For example, McLeod and Hawley concluded that the groups differed in terms of the

structure emerging from a factor analysis of judgments on a Semantic Differential scale of the basic

concepts, Ideal Newspaper, *Milwaukee Journal* and *Milwaukee Sentinel*.[7] They also found that the actual

attitudes or judgments of the more professional journalists were more distinct from those of the non-

editorial employees than were the attitudes and judgments of the less professional journalists. For

example, the professionals wanted the Ideal Newspaper to be more unbiased, unemotional, useful,

valuable, important and responsible than did the other groups. And that the more professional journalists

demonstrated more homogeneity of judgment than did the less professional journalists. Finally, the more

professional journalists were found to be more supportive of implementation of professional behaviors

and more critical of their papers than the less professional journalists.

McLeod and his former doctoral student, Ramona R. Rush, published two articles in 1969 using

the Professional Orientation concept. In the first of these pieces (McLeod and Rush, 1969a), the authors

differentiated their concept from "professionalization," which they say "refers to change in an occupation

over time (p. 584)." Their Professional Orientation concept "looked at the self-definition aspect although

it is considered a very important part of the professionalization process."[8]

Data used by McLeod and Rush (1969a) came from a survey administered by McLeod to

students in a seminar he taught at Centro Internacional de Estudios Superiores de Periodismo para

America Latina (CIESPAL) in Quito, Ecuador, in September of 1966. Slightly adapted versions of 22 of

the 24 items used by McLeod and Hawley (1964) were used.[9] Responses of the 46 journalists in the

---

[7]The measures used to index the dependent variables grew out of the contemporary work of measurement of meaning (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957) and was influenced by McLeod's collaboration with Tannenbaum, then director of MCRC at Wisconsin. McLeod and Hawley reference an article by Tannenbaum and McLeod (1963) for more details on and justification of the measures they employed of the dependent variables in their analysis.

[8]McLeod and Rush (1969a) do not report the actual phrasing of the question. Marvick (1954) asked: "Does your job in (organization) actually provide this?"

[9]Item 12 was dropped from the Professional Items in Table 1 and Item 5 was dropped from the Non-Professional Items.

seminar were compared with the responses of the Milwaukee journalists as reported in McLeod and Hawley (1964). In general, differences were not striking.

McLeod and Rush (1969a) also include an analysis not conducted in McLeod and Hawley (1964). Borrowing from Marvick (1954), McLeod asked the Latin American journalists not only to rate how important a series of job characteristics were in any job, but he also asked the journalist the extent to which he or she was able to obtain these same characteristics in his or her home country. McLeod and Rush subtract the two scores to obtain a "measure of job satisfaction." Job satisfaction, in other words, was conceptually distinct from the professional orientation concept, but it was operationalized as the difference between what journalists wanted in a job and what their current job provided them. Data from the Milwaukee study using this same measure are reported here for the first time. Overall the Latin American journalists showed lower job satisfaction than did the U.S. journalists.

McLeod and Rush (1964b) used the data from the journalists in the CIESPAL seminar to look at both antecedents and consequences of professional orientation. Those journalists in the seminar who had studied journalism at the university scored higher on the professional orientation measure. Males were more likely to be professionally oriented than females. Younger journalists were more professional than older ones, but those with more experience in journalism also were more professional. McLeod and Rush (1969b) report that none of these antecedents of professional orientation had been present in the Milwaukee study. As in the U.S. study (McLeod and Hawley, 1964), McLeod and Rush (1969b) found that the more professional Latin American journalists were more critical of the content of their own newspapers. No clear differences were found between those high and those low in professional orientation in the Latin American study in terms of attitudes toward implementation of professional standards. In contrast, the findings in the Milwaukee study indicated that professionals were more supportive of implementation of professional development. The Latin American journalists high in professional orientation had a more complex factor structure in analysis of their evaluations of the "ideal" newspaper and their own newspaper.

McLeod and Rush (1969a) report that there was a significant amount of work being done on professional orientation in the Mass Communication Research Center at the University of Wisconsin at the

time the manuscript was prepared. They cite the dissertation work of K .E. Eapen (1969) on Indian journalists and Oguz Nayman (1971) on Turkish journalists as well as additional work on Latin American journalists by Lloyd Bostian, John McNelly and Ramona Rush. According to McLeod and Rush (1969a), McLeod, with colleagues James Fosdick and students Beatrice Linehan and James Scotton, also were conducting a study of Wisconsin newsmen at the time. None of this work was ever published.

Some of the findings of this research, however, were cited by McLeod (1971), in a convention paper he presented to the Research Committee of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. In this piece, McLeod distinguishes between professionalization, or the process of change by which an occupation moves from a craft to a profession, and degree of professionalism, or the way the journalist views his or her job. In using this terminology, McLeod moved away from the terminology of his earlier work (professional orientation) and closer to that dominant in other literatures. Bobbitt, Breinholt, Doktor and McNaul (1978), in the organizational literature, for example, define degree of professionalism as the extent to which an individual has internalized the value system of a profession. Degree of professionalization, in this terminology, is the extent to which an occupation has the characteristics of a profession.[10] The key question for McLeod (1971) was: Are the more professional news workers and more professional media organizations, i.e., those hiring more professional news workers, different from the less professional news workers and less professional news organizations? McLeod (1971) was looking for three types of consequences: in the attitudes and judgments of the news workers, in the performance of their news organizations, and in the desire of the news workers to stay in the occupation rather than leave it.

The 1971 convention paper was meant as a summary of work to date, and McLeod drew on the Milwaukee study (McLeod and Hawley, 1964), the study of Latin American journalists (McLeod and Rush, 1969 a & b), the dissertations of Eapen (1969) and Nayman (1971) and on a "1969 study of 219 Wisconsin newsmen from almost all newspapers in that state" except the two Milwaukee papers,

---

[10]See Becker, Fruit and Caudill (1987) for an elaboration on this distinction, p. 20.

excluded because they were studied earlier.[11] The Wisconsin study showed, McLeod wrote, that news workers higher in terms of degree of professionalism were more likely than others to approve ways to implement professional development, such as specialization and refresher courses. McLeod (1971) reported that all of these studies showed that the greater the professionalism of news workers, the more likely they are to be critical of the news organization for which they worked.

The evidence for the impact of professionalism on organizational performance was incomplete, McLeod (1971) said, but it included a finding that papers judged highly in terms of photojournalism had photojournalists who scored high on the degree of professionalism measure, while papers judged poorly in terms of photojournalism had photojournalists who scored low on the degree of professionalism measure.[12] The photojournalists on the better papers also reported the papers they worked for provided them more of the job characteristics they wanted than did the photojournalists on the weaker papers.

The Wisconsin state study, McLeod (1971) reported, showed that the papers with journalists scoring higher in terms of professionalism achieved better performance scores. Even more strongly, however, the data showed a relationship between the provision of professional working conditions–as judged by the journalists–and performance.

Finally, McLeod (1971) reported, the Wisconsin study showed that journalists higher on the degree of professionalism index were less willing to leave newspaper work for work in public relations, based on the reported incentives needed to get them to take a public relations job.

In summary, McLeod (1971) wrote, "we have found some evidence that professionalism and professional working conditions are tied to three important elements of the newspaper operation: to the attitudes and judgments of newsmen regarding their newspaper, to the performance of that newspaper, and to the desire to remain in newspaper work."

---

[11]The Wisconsin study, according to McLeod (2001), included the survey data from Linehan's thesis (Linehan, 1970) and a content analysis of the state's papers to "establish dimensions of quality of local coverage." McLeod noted that one paper, *The Waukesha Freeman*, refused to participate in the study because they "thought we were commies."

[12]McLeod (1971) attributes this work to Coldwell (1974).

The 1971 convention paper thus ends on an optimistic note about the importance of and merit of the degree of professionalism measure. At the same time, the results reported suggest more strongly than did the earlier articles a distinction between the concept of *degree of professionalism* and two other concepts, *job satisfaction* and a measure of *working conditions*. McLeod and Rush (1969a) had used the difference between the measure of job characteristics sought and job characteristics of the current job to index *job satisfaction*. In the convention paper, the measure of job characteristics of the current job is used alone as a measure of *working conditions*.

In the unpublished paper with Hawley (McLeod and Hawley, 1965), the satisfaction concept had played an important role. McLeod and Hawley (p. 2) argued: "We believe that a newspaper functions efficiently to the extent to which the satisfaction obtained in the newspaper job approaches what the person desires from a job, and in proportion to the matching of his image of his newspaper and an 'ideal' newspaper. It is also reasonable to suspect that a newspaper organization functions more efficiently if there is substantial agreement of image and attitudes among the various departments of that paper."[13] The lack of subsequent work by McLeod in the professionalism vein has left unexplored the distinction between degree of professionalism and the two other concepts, job satisfaction and working conditions. No other studies using the McLeod and Hawley measures seem to have addressed it.

Domestic and International Research

In the decade following McLeod and Hawley's (1964) initial study, Wisconsin graduate students formed a nucleus of researchers replicating the original investigation of professionalism. As Nayman (1973) noted in his introduction to a series of studies published on professionalism in the journal *Gazette*, each of the studies had made slight modifications but had attempted to provide empirical evidence of the three major assumptions: 1) it is more realistic and useful to study the professional orientation of communications than to investigate the professional characteristics of journalistic occupations; 2) one should apply standard measures to obtain comparative and cumulative data about

---

[13]The concern with newspaper image grew out of the work with Tannenbaum (Tannenbaum and McLeod, 1963) and was a forerunner of the program of research McLeod carried out later with Kosicki and others.

professional orientation of journalists; and 3) professionally oriented journalists show differences that distinguish them in their behavior and attitudes from their less professionally oriented colleagues (p.205).

Lattimore and Nayman (1974) surveyed editorial employees at 26 Colorado newspapers using a 21-item version of the original McLeod and Hawley's (1964) and found age was associated with professional orientation.[14] They found a greater degree of professionalism among those whom Lattimore and Nayman (1974) called "young Turks." The higher professional orientation was characterized by the thirst for more power to make content and policy decisions, a favoring of experimentation and originality, and a frustration with the limitations of news coverage in their respective papers. Lattimore and Nayman's (1974) study challenged the maxim "the longer the experience, the better the news person."

Another of McLeod's students, Coldwell (1974), used the McLeod and Hawley professional orientation scale in a study of 83 press photographers. Coldwell added performance as a variable and found greater professional orientation to be associated with superior performance. Those from newspapers judged "superior" in photographic performance had a higher professional orientation than those from newspapers identified as having "inferior" photography.   The most professionally oriented personnel in the inferior group were the most critical of their newspapers' editorial policy and practices. The findings from this study advanced the McLeod and Hawley concept by identifying a crucial outcome of professional orientation: perceived performance of the organization.

In an exploratory study, Weinthal and O'Keefe (1974) used the McLeod-Hawley scale to survey a small sample of broadcast journalists in the Denver area. They found broadcast journalists ranked nearly the same values or job characteristics as their newspaper colleagues as indicative of a higher professional orientation. The broadcasters differed from newspaper journalists in that they had a much higher desire for "freedom from continual close supervision over work" and for "excitement and variety the job provides" (p. 204). In a departure from the Lattimore and Nayman (1974) work, Weinthal and O'Keefe (1974) did not find a strong relationship between age and professionalism.

---

[14]Lattimore and Nayman used the modification of the original scale proposed by Nayman (1971). Item 4 in the Professional Items in Table 1 was replaced with the following item: Improving your professional competence. Item 12 was dropped. In the Non-Professional list, items 5 and 12 were dropped and item 7 was modified to: Enjoyment of what's involved in doing the job.

Idsvoog and Hoyt (1977) used the McLeod and Hawley instrument in a field survey of 81

journalists in six Wisconsin markets to measure the professionalism and the job dissatisfaction of the

respondents. In addition, Idsvgood and Hoyt examined their job performance through the evaluation of

mistakes the respondents found in two television newsfilm scripts. As predicted, the journalists who

scored high in professionalism were more likely to find errors in the scripts than those who scored low in

professionalism. No difference between groups was found in terms of job dissatisfaction. Consistent with

studies of print journalists, Idsvoog and Hoyt found that broadcast journalists who scored high in

professionalism were less likely than the others to be willing to leave television news for a higher paying

job outside television.

Garrison and Salwen (1989) also employed the McLeod and Hawley scale to examine the

perceptions of 249 sports editors of the sports journalists' professional orientations. In addition, the

sports journalists editors were asked to assess the professional orientations of their colleagues who

write hard news and soft news. The results suggested that sports editors view the sports journalists as

professionals who possess traits that are comparable with the professional traits of the journalists who

report hard news and soft news.

Additional Work Outside the U.S.

Professionalization of journalism and the consequences of professionalism have been

prominent in the German mass communication literature (Kepplinger and Vohl, 1979; Weischenberg,

1995).[15] As in the United States, a primary concern has been the extent to which journalism meets

some standard of professionalism. The conclusion most often reached, according to Weischenberg

(1995) is that it does not. This discussion depends heavily on the sociological literature on occupations

from the 1950s and 1960s in the United States and in Germany.

The German literature has also examined the individual consequences of occupational

professionalization by looking at what Kepplinger and Voll (1979) call professional norms. Kepplinger

and Voll draw from the work of Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman (1972) rather than from the work of

---

[15]Weischenberg credits McLeod and his students with having had great impact on the study in
Germany of professionalism among journalists (p. 493).

McLeod and his students. What is distinct about the Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman approach is that it focuses on journalistic values that are only tangentially linked to the trait approach to professions. Journalists are classified as having one of two sets of values: an activist value set, which is labeled as professional, and a neutral value set, which is not considered to be professional.

An example of a professional norm used by Kepplinger and Voll is the "duty to be careful" in reporting so as to make sure the story is correct. Often, in the view of Kepplinger and Voll (1979), there are conflicts between operative norms. For example, publishing the names of crime suspects is dictated by the need to inform the citizenry but not by the desire to protect the rights of individual suspects.

The focus on norms in the German literature stems from the belief that professionalization of occupations leads to the development of professional norms or behaviors, and in the case of journalists, to changed practices. While the work of McLeod focused on development of professional "orientations" on the part of individuals in occupations and the consequences of professional orientations, the German literature seems to skip the intermediary step and does not deal in much detail with the professional orientations themselves. According to Weischenberg (1995), these professional norms are learned through socialization, which largely takes place on the job. Weischenberg and previously Kepplinger (1979) give much consideration to the potential role of education as a determinant of these norms. German journalists do not follow consistent paths to journalism in that formal journalism training is not the norm.

The lack of journalism training was similar in Canada. Wright (1974) noted that in the 1970s Canadian journalists had few opportunities for formal journalism education. Wright surveyed journalists in five Canadian provinces and used the McLeod-Hawley scale to test their level of professional orientation. At the time of the study, Canada had few journalism education programs, which was evident in the lack of formal education and professional training reported by respondents. Wright was responding to a Canadian government report that claimed Canadian journalists were low in professionalism. With a focus similar to that of McLeod and Hawley, Wright argued that journalism should not be examined as a profession or a non-profession. According to Wright, the question of whether or not journalism is a profession should be asked in terms of the individual and not the practice.

Wright found that more than half the journalists surveyed showed high professional orientation in some areas, contrary to the Canadian government's report of a lack of journalistic professionalism.

The literature is not consistent in the definition and interpretation of professional communicator as a concept. The French researchers have in mind a broad range of occupations:

> What do I understand by 'professionals'? My perspective is broad. I include here those who are *within* the institution: directors, producers, production personnel, journalists, and engineers. Those who are on the top, even for a short time: the general managers, their desk staff, their representatives, and also the ministers of Communication and their predecessors, and also the ministers of Information, which are much more influential. I am also thinking of those who are external, but whose opinion matters: members of the parliament, and especially those who write many reports on which, step by step, the opinion of the political class is built upon. Eventually, the journalists working for specialized media are not the last to distribute what has been previously achieved in the professional and political fields. (C.J. Bertrand & F. Bordat, 1989, p. 171-172. The original version in French.)

In studying Swedish journalists, Windahl and Rosengren (1976) differentiated between individual professionalization and collective professionalization. They defined individual professionalization as a form of socialization, and collective professionalization as a process that involves the profession as a whole. The article analyzed only the collective professionalization of Swedish journalism by examining: the professional attributes of the existence of a professional organization; specialized education and training; a code of ethics; degree of autonomy; a claim of monopoly over certain types of work; and the expression of a service ideal. Looking at these collective criteria, they found that Swedish journalists were "striving towards a professional status" but journalism had not been fully realized as a profession.

Tunstall (1971), based on his survey of 207 correspondents at 23 British national news organizations, questioned whether British journalists were part of a profession.

In contrast, in emerging democracies professional identification is strong, and it is usually associated with the idea of occupational excellence. As an example, each of the 38 Polish journalists interviewed in a survey (Oledsky, 1998) mentioned professionalism while describing the characteristics of their work. One explanation for this attitude is that, during totalitarian regimes, the journalist was often considered a propagandist, a person with a dubious job description. As a consequence, legitimacy and higher occupational status are constant goals for journalists in emerging democracies. The paradox is that while they are vying for professional status, many journalists in emerging democracies do not see education in journalism and mass communication as a necessary condition.

In an earlier study in Chile, Dario Menanteau-Horta (1967) surveyed 235 Chilean journalists and found the majority of them were relatively young, with an education that was the equivalent to that of a U.S. high school diploma. They had clear vocational motivation and demonstrated professional identification. Though Menanteau-Horta references McLeod and Hawley (1964), he does not measure the degree of professionalism of the newsworkers. In a later study, Day (1968) reached similar conclusions based on responses of a sample of journalists working in the capitals of Argentina, Bolivia and Mexico. He found that his journalists were slightly professional in terms of the characteristics desired in a job but not professional in terms of the characteristics actually existing on the job. An unspecified number of questions in Day's questionnaire were the Spanish version of items from the McLeod-Hawley (1964) study.

Professionalism in Advertising and Public Relations

Much earlier than McLeod and Hawley's seminal work on professionalism among newsman, advertising practitioners were trying to identify advertising as a profession. From the beginning of the 20th century, practitioners sought professionalization in large part to sanction the social status of advertising and legitimize its economic advantages (Schultze, 1981). Largely because of the business aspects and characteristic bureaucratic organization of advertising, however, advertising work had difficulty being perceived as a profession.

Ward (1966), another of McLeod's students, conducted a study regarding professionalism in advertising agencies. Following Lieberman's (1956) characteristics of profession, Ward argued that

professional status might be viewed as largely a matter of definition. Ward surveyed practitioners in four advertising agencies in Chicago, Pittsburgh and New York using McLeod and Hawley's (1964) operationalizations. The goal of the study was to determine how professional and non-professional workers differed from each other in their frames of reference, homogeneity of judgment, extent of criticism of the agency for which they work, and social background. He also wanted to know if the professional's perception of job status was higher than the self-perception of the non-professional, and if job status ranking varied according to whether the worker was in the account service or a service department. Ward found that professionals and non-professionals had rather similar frames of reference even though professionals gave more emphasis to evaluative and ethical factors while non-professionals emphasized excitement and activity factors. Ward also found that professionals did not demonstrate greater homogeneity of judgment. While professionals were not significantly more critical of their own agency than were the non-professionals, the professionals gave more importance to and perceived the greatest discrepancies between job characteristics underlying the evaluative-ethical factor. Neither the professionals nor the non-professionals ranked agency jobs as high among a list of jobs with varying degrees of occupational prestige (Ward, 1966).

Subsequent studies of professionalism in advertising deal with the history of the advertising industry's efforts to be a profession (Schultze, 1981; Kreshel 1990).

Like the advertising industry, public relations has struggled to gain professional status. The most active stream of research in mass communication on professionalism is in public relations. Much of this work has been at the level of the occupation, but a few researchers have used the McLeod and Hawley (1964) approach to look at individual professional orientation. Among those who have, Nayman, McKee and Lattimore (1977), who used a variation of the McLeod-Hawley scale to compare professional orientations of print journalists with those of public relations personnel. The researchers surveyed Colorado daily journalists and members of Colorado public relations professional organizations. In addition to the professional orientation scale, the questionnaire included items on professional implementation, training, ethical responsibilities and demographic information.

Nayman et.al (1977) found that public relations respondents rated both the non-professional and professional items higher than did the journalists. Public relations professionals were significantly more likely to give importance to being part of the decision-making process in an organization than were journalists. Public relations practitioners also put more value on "opportunity for originality" and "full use of ability and training" than did journalists. Journalists differed in that they valued "respect for the ability of co-workers" and having their efforts appreciated by their supervisors. Nayman et al. found both journalists and public relations practitioners placed less importance on most of the non-professional items than they placed on professional items. Overall, journalists were more dissatisfied with their jobs than were public relations practitioners, especially when focusing on the comparison between the importance they place on their efforts being appreciated by a supervisor and actual appreciation received in their own jobs.

Hallahan (1974) used the McLeod and Hawley scale to measure professionalism among public relations practitioners. Hallahan examined whether a professional association (Public Relations Society of America) had a role in professional socialization of its members. He surveyed PRSA members and non-member practitioners and found no significant differences between member and non-member professional values or norms. He also found no significant difference between the two groups' concern for conformity to professional norms, and he found practitioners generally considered themselves more professional than their peers in the public relations field.

Wright (1978) surveyed public relations practitioners using the McLeod and Hawley scale, asking respondents to rate the characteristics based on an "ideal" job and then on their present jobs. He found public relations practitioners to be professionally oriented based on answers to the "ideal" situation, but found that their actual jobs did not reflect the level of professionalism to which they aspired.

Hallahan and Wright used empirical methods to examine the professional status of public relations at a time when most discussion was limited to essays on why public relations should or should not be considered a profession. More recent public relations literature addresses professionalism in several ways, but most studies are fundamentally centered on a trait approach to professionalism, including an emphasis on practitioner roles, and "power-control" (Grunig, 2001).

While early empirical studies in public relations professionalism by Hallahan (1974) and Wright (1978) focused on practitioner orientations, the focus of later research has been more on characteristics of the profession and the perception of those characteristics by practitioners and others outside the field. While McLeod and Hawley asked if it makes a difference to what extent journalists see themselves as professionals, public relations researchers have shifted the focus to whether it makes a difference whether practitioners and others view public relations as having professional characteristics. For example, Sallot, Cameron and Weaver-Lariscy published a series of articles about the state of public relations as a profession (Cameron, Sallot & Weaver-Lariscy, 1996; Sallot, Cameron & Weaver-Lariscy, 1997, 1998). In their first article, the research team surveyed public relations professionals and found areas of established professional standards but several areas that were lacking (Cameron, Sallot & Weaver-Lariscy, 1996). The second article (Sallot, Cameron & Weaver-Lariscy, 1997) reported results of a survey of public relations educators who answered questions about the extent to which a standard of professionalism exists for specific public relations practices . Rather than measuring practitioners' professional orientations, the study centered on perceptions of characteristics of the practice itself. A year later the group (Sallot, Cameron & Weaver-Lariscy, 1998) reported results of a survey of public relations practitioners about professional standards in public relations and found little consensus among the practitioners regarding professional standards. In addition, the researchers asked practitioners how they thought their peers would answer the questions and found respondents underestimated their counterparts' assessments of professional standards.

Other researchers also have looked at how the public views public relations. Spicer (1993) analyzed newspaper articles to see how journalists' referenced public relations and found that journalists perceive public relations practitioners as press agents and publicity seekers, not professionally oriented communicators. Similarly, Miller (1999) examined public relations as portrayed in entertainment media, including books and movies, and found public relations practitioners were portrayed as superficial and less than professionally oriented.

Further research on public relations as a profession centers on specific traits, such as the body of knowledge to be assimilated, and education, autonomy, professional accreditation and licensing. In

the late 1980s, the Public Relations Society of America appointed a task force to help identify and develop a defining body of public relations literature, and researchers like Bissland and Rentner (1989) tried to discover if a specialized public relations education made a difference in practitioners' measures of professionalism. At the time, a majority of respondents to the survey did not have a specialized public relations education. For those who did, Bissland and Rentner found little difference in their commitment to professional characteristics of autonomy, use of specialized public relations models, and commitment to the profession relative to those in the study who did not have a specialized background. A study in 1992 found that a majority of practitioners and chief executive officers think majoring in public relations is not necessary to prepare for a career in public relations (Schwartz, Yarbrough & Shakra, 1992).

Johansen (2001) looked at professionalization efforts by Canadian public relations practitioners to enhance the occupation's status by launching a professional organization. He traces the historical development of professionalization efforts in Canada to the formation of the Canadian Public Relations Society, which was charged with maintaining an elite membership. "CPRS worked to establish public relations as a career in its own right, and not merely something to be tacked on to the duties of a marketing manager, personnel director, corporate lawyer, or even secretary" (Johansen, 2001, p. 63). The organization also was given the task of building respect for public relations among the general public and among employers (potential and actual). As a collective, the group worked to enhance public relations practitioners' images to the public, while building value for their roles within organizations and prestige for the positions within the corporate structure (Johansen, 2001).

Researchers in the United States also recognized the effect that the roles played by practitioners in organizations have on the perception of public relations as a profession. Broom and Dozier (1986) and Dozier (1995) discuss the manager and technician roles of practitioners within organizations. Manager roles are perceived as more professional, with traits such as job responsibilities, autonomy, and power within an organization determining whether a practitioner is managerially or technically oriented. Further, public relations researchers identified membership in an organization's highest level of decision making, referred to as the "dominant coalition" as key to whether a practitioner was in a manager or technician role (Dozier, Grunig & Grunig, 1995; Grunig 1992). Practitioners embedded in the

dominant coalition had more decision-making power, and a stronger management role, than did

practitioners outside the dominant coalition. Serini (1993) conducted an observation study in which she

examined how public relations practitioners sought decisional autonomy in a high tech firm. She argued

that autonomy in an organization is an important characteristic of a profession. She concluded that the

professionalism helped the PR practitioners to change the management of the firm. Citing Beam (1990),

Grunig (2001) calls this a "power-control" approach in which researchers measure the amount of power

and control practitioners have to "carry out their work based on the knowledge and standards of their

profession" (p. 26). This approach, however, focuses on a specific professional trait – autonomy.

Contemporary View of Professionalism in Sociology of Work and Occupations

For sociologists in the first half of the 20th century, professions were evaluated on their structural

and functional similarities. The four traditional professions--the clergy, the military, medicine and the law--

were looked at as models for the evaluation of all other professions. The characteristics that these

professions embodied became the eight criteria articulated by Lieberman in his 1956 book, *Education as a

Profession*, and served as the benchmark for McLeod and Hawley's professional orientation measures.

At one level, professions were thought to serve a specific role in society. This ideal was advocated

by many sociologists, including Durkheim who saw professional organization providing social cohesion

and who viewed professional ethics as the foundation of a new moral order (1957).

Lieberman also connected the increasing importance of the professions in modern life to the

advancement of democracy, a perspective that was popular in the heat of the Cold War. He asserted that

the advancement of professions requires a degree of independence and autonomy "which could hardly be

tolerated in a totalitarian society," and concluded that "perhaps it is more to the point to see that our

continuing to have a democratic society depends in part upon our continuing to have professions" (1956,

p. 11).

The service ideal needed to be addressed if professions were to proliferate in the emerging

capitalist bureaucracies and technocracies. The professional characteristics advanced by Talcott Parsons

(1954) sought to extend professional status to encompass occupations in the business sector. Parsons

attempted to moderate the self-centered, egoistic portrayal of the businessman by re-categorizing the

profit motive as a particular occupational situation that leads the business professional to her or his ultimate objective of achievement and recognition within the occupational group. This would position business in a light similar to medicine or law, where individual ambition and success are considered common among professional members.

Lieberman also recognized that individual motivations can be problematic for the professions. Although his sixth professional characteristic refers to the "emphasis upon the service to be rendered, rather than the economic gain to the practitioner," it does not necessarily apply to the motives of the individual worker. Lieberman asserted that the structure of professional organization controlled for the individual attitudes and ideals of professional workers, making it difficult for them to "avoid certain obligations, regardless of their professional feelings" (1956, p. 5).

McLeod and Hawley also cited an article by Wilensky (1964), who identified a sequence of stages that came to characterize the structural approach to professional evaluation. The *process* of professionalization was embraced by many occupations as a test of legitimation. According to Wilensky, in order to reach professional status, occupations needed to establish training schools, form professional associations, attempt to regulate their practice through legal protection, and adopt a formal code of ethics--in that order.

Wilensky's professionalization process systematized what Lieberman earlier referred to as organizational control. The evolution of work from occupation to profession required the development of norms of professional conduct, or ethics, demonstrating a benefit to society. McLeod and Hawley's study looked beyond the boundary of structural traits to focus on the attitudes and perspectives of newsworkers that Lieberman, Wilensky and other sociologists had identified in terms of the service ideal.

By the 1970s, a significant new perspective of profession began to gather momentum in the literature. Instead of examining the role of the professions in serving society, sociologists began to focus on issues of conflict, power and control. Freidson (1970), Johnson (1972) and Larson (1977) represented this new, critical way of looking at the relationships between the professions and society. They saw the organizational structure of the professions as monopolistic, designed to limit access to entry into the profession as well as limit the availability of professional services.

Profession was a method of controlling the relationship between an occupation and the consumer or client, and maintaining authority and privilege. In his critique of the structural-functional approach to profession, Johnson charged that these models "are not definitions of occupations at all, but specify the characteristics of a peculiar institutionalized form of occupational control" (1972, p. 27).

Professional authority became a vehicle for individuals to gain an advantage outside of the professional-client relationship as well. According to Larson, professional status brought with it a level of personal recognition and social prestige that could be used to benefit the individual "in the context of everyday transactions" (1977, p. 180).

The issues of control and authority were not new to the sociology of professions. What was new was the challenges to these concepts from an ideological perspective that questioned the essential element of the service ideal. By stripping away the professional emperor's clothes, adherents to the power approach sought to reveal the true nature of the professional organization.

The 1980s brought a convergence of the structural-functional and power approaches to the study of professions. Abbott (1988) reoriented the focus from the institutional and organizational structure of the professions to the nature of professional work. Abbott's concept of professions begins with his interpretation of Carr-Saunders and Wilson's (1933b) classic definition of professionals as "persons in possession of specialized intellectual techniques" (Carr-Saunders & Wilson, 1933b, p. 295). Abbott's approach is to look at how these intellectual techniques–or an "abstract system of knowledge" in Abbott's words–are controlled by the professions and applied to specific situations by professionals. The competition between occupational groups for jurisdiction--or a professional domain--is played out in the application of abstract knowledge.

Defending professional jurisdiction can be an internal or external struggle. Groups within the professional domain can try to break away, taking certain expert tasks with them to create a new profession. Externally, threats can come from social, cultural and economic forces, or technological advancements that can create a new stratum of experts within a traditional professional jurisdiction. Structural traits are important in Abbott's analysis because they demonstrate how professions attempt to strengthen their jurisdictional claims through institutional control of individual actions.

The sociological literature has looked at the degree of professionalism of workers in a way different from the approach of McLeod. For example, in medicine, scholars have defined professional characteristics such as the practice of keeping humanitarian codes of ethics, the degree of collegueship and the relationship between the practitioner and client (Montague, 1966). More recently, researchers in pharmacy (Hammer, 2000) and nursing (Adams and Miller, 2001) use similar categories to examine professionalism. As the citation analysis in Chapter 14 shows, the McLeod and Hawley approach did not have impact outside the field of mass communication.

Alternatives to the McLeod Approach

The sociological literature contains an alternative approach to that of McLeod and Hawley (1964) in the work of Hall (1968). In a study of 328 workers from 11 different occupations, Hall identified five different attitudes that he said measured the "attitudinal attributes of professionalism." These were: (1) use of professionalism organization as a major source of ideas and judgments in the professional work, (2) a belief in service to the public, (3) a belief in self-regulation, (4) a sense of calling to the field, including a desire to work even if few extrinsic rewards were available, and (5) a feeling of autonomy, or the sense that the practitioner should be able to make decisions without external pressures from clients, those not members of the profession, and the employing organization. examined a range of occupations to identify individual attitudinal attributes of professionalism. Two of Hall's attitudinal attributes, service to the public and a feeling of autonomy, are similar to two items in the McLeod and Hawley (1964) scale. Hall found that some of the "established" professions, such as lawyers and physicians, had rather weakly developed professional attitudes, while some of those in occupations usually not considered to be fully professionalized, such as teachers, social workers and nurses, scored high on the attitudinal scales. Hall attributed this to the relatively low financial compensation these field receive and a corresponding sense of dedication to the profession as a way of explaining acceptance of this.

Leroy (1972-73) used the Hall (1968) approach to develop a set of measures of professionalism in a study of television newsworkers in 20 U.S. markets. Leroy found that professionalism tended to be associated with "bigness." Respondents at large, group-owned broadcast or newspaper outlets exhibited higher levels of professionalism than those owned by smaller companies. The use of the scale allowed

for the comparison of journalists with Hall's sample of occupations in terms of their degree of professionalism. Leroy's television sample was generally below Hall's median rank.

Haga, Graen and Dansereau (1974) drew on Hall to create measures of the professionalism of managers in a college housing and food service division. They found that highly professional managers behaved quite differently from their low professional counterparts. Specifically, the highly professional managers worked harder and longer on tasks associated with their roles.

Dyer (1977) also used Hall's attitudinal approach in a study of social workers with bachelor's degree to compare their professional, bureaucratic and client service orientation with those of social workers trained by an agency. He found that the workers with a bachelor's degree had a stronger tendency to accept professional work norms than their agency-trained counterparts.

More recently, studies of professional workers such as lawyers and doctors have referenced Hall's use of individual autonomy and self-regulation as important factors in job satisfaction and professional commitment. Wallace (1995) included autonomy as a variable in both job satisfaction and organizational commitment in a study of lawyers working in 136 Canadian law firms. The findings suggested that corporatist control generally increases job satisfaction and organizational commitment for professionals. Hoff (2000) used Hall's autonomy and self-regulation characteristics to represent professional values in a survey measuring professional commitment among physician executives in their roles as managed-care administrators. The findings showed that the professional commitment of the physician executives was positively related to doing clinical work and that it helped them maintain their professional identities.

Only the study by Leroy (1972-73) in those reviewed above based on the Hall (1968) approach actually employed a standardized set of measures of professional attitudes. The other studies rather are conceptually linked to Hall in that they employ the same reasoning about what professional attitudes are.

Over the years, a number of researchers in communication have modified the original McLeod and Hawley (1964) measures (Lattimore and Nayman,1974; and Nayman, Atkin, and O'Keefe,1973; Henningham,1984). One reason for the modification was the belief that McLeod and Hawley's approach assumed journalists' non-professional traits were in some way "anti-professional" (Henningham, 1984).

The original McLeod and Hawley measure employed 24 items, half of which were professional in nature, and half of which were not. An individual's score on the index was based on the sum of the 12 professional items minus the sum of the 12 items not considered to be measures of professionalism. To give additional weight to the professional items, Nayman (1973) advocated that the professional items be summed and that this value be added to the difference between the professional and nonprofessional items. Windahl and Rosengren (1978) argued that the two dimensions should be treated as independent of each other, so that individuals could be classified as high on both, low on both, or mixed accordingly. Windahl and Rosengren report conflicting results using the different strategies. Specifically, education was found to be positively related to professionalism using the McLeod and Hawley measure but negatively related if the dimensions are treated as independent.

Henninghan (1984) used McLeod and Hawley's original scale, the scale as modified by Nayman's (1973), and Windhal and Rosengren's version in which professionalism is measured solely by summing the professional items to study the level of professional orientation of 215 Australian journalists. Henningham found differences in level of professional orientation depending on which of these modified scales was used. For example, when the original McLeod and Hawley version of the scale was used, education of the journalists was found to be positively related to professionalism, while little relationship was found with the Nayman version and a negative relationship was found with the Windahl and Rosengren approach.

Another criticism of the McLeod and Hawley work has come from Starck and Sudhaker (1978). They argue that the comparative work of McLeod and his students in Latin America and elsewhere assumes that professionalism should be defined "as being in the likeness of the advanced free press world with its particular pattern of performance, status and social role sanctioned in political theory" (p. 5). They argue that definitions of professionalism must take into consideration cultural, historical, social, political and economic conditions of the press and society in the country studied. Starck and Sudhaker echo the criticism of Golding (1977), who says that professionalism research became a form of cultural imperialism, in which western standards were imposed on other countries.

McLeod and Hawley approach has been criticized on purely conceptual grounds as well. Carey

(1969) questioned the idea that journalists should even seek to be professional. In his view, objective reporting, which became a fetish and a fundamental component of professional competence by the end of the 19th century, limited journalists' independence. It turned the journalist from an autonomous interpreter of events into a passive reporter. In Carey's perspective, "objective reporting" is mainly a technical skill (as opposed to intellectual skills such as interpreting or analyzing) and limits the journalist's role to a passive transmitter of information from institutions to the public. In this role of mediator between institutions and large audiences, the journalist has the tendency to be more favorable to the interests of the source than to those of the public. This model, argued Carey, was effective in the context of rapid industrialization. Its commercial purpose was to reach heterogeneous audiences.

Adopting Braverman's (1975) terminology, Hardt (2000) eludes to the process of "deskilling" in the work of journalists, referring to journalists' abandonment of creativity and of the ability to interpret events in favor of the technical routine within a system under increased control by media management.

In a separate critique of the McLeod and Hawley approach, Beam (1990) argued that professionalism should be treated as an organizational concept rather than an individual-level concept. In other words, organizations, such as newspapers or television stations, should be classified in terms of their professionalism, or the degree to which their policies, procedures and customs conform with professional standards and expectations. Ultimately, Beam argued, it should be possible to show that organizational professionalism is linked to content. Beam is critical of the approach of McLeod (1971) particularly, who argued that professionalism of media organizations can be assessed by summing the individual professionalism scores of journalists within those organizations. Such an approach, Beam argued, "assumes all people in a news media organization exert an equal effect over the actions of the organizations and, therefore, that the average professional orientation of staff members constitutes an acceptable measure of an organizational-level phenomenon" (1990, p. 33).

The Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman (1972) work, and the related work reviewed above from Germany, also represents a significant departure from the work of McLeod and his colleagues. It argues that to be professional is to hold certain attitudes. In the Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman case, to be professional is to be an activist rather than a passive reporter–or at least to hold attitudes consistent with activism rather than passive attitudes. Kepplinger and Voll (1979) speak of a "duty to be careful" as an example of a professional norm. These authors are not concerned with the work environment but, rather, with attitudes that, a priori, are labeled professional, presumably because they, too, reflect a social or community orientation. The Johnston, Slawski and Bowman (1972) has been followed by Weaver and Wilhoit (1991, 1996) in their sequels to the study of American journalists, and this approach seems to be more common at present that than that advocated by McLeod and Hawley (1964). Henningham (1996), in a second study of Australian journalists, employed this strategy. It also is the cornerstone of the comparative studies reported in Weaver (1998)

Conclusions

McLeod's work on professionalism, as we have noted, continues to be cited today. In fact, it would be unusual for a literature review on the topic of professionalism in journalism or some other mass communication occupation to bypass it.

In a very odd way, however, much of the literature that cites McLeod's work seems to have missed its conceptual underpinnings and ignored its implications. To some extent, this seems to be the fault of the original formulations. To some extent, it probably is a simple consequence of the context of that work.

Ironically or not, the original conceptualization of professionalism by McLeod seems to have anticipated the development of work on this concept in the larger field of work and occupations. The utility of the concept, as explicated by McLeod, probably rests with a reconsideration of its origins, its meaning, and its linkages to more general arguments about what being professional means in modern society.

The concept, degree of professionalism, as originally explicated by McLeod and his students (originally under the name degree of professional orientation) was a reflection of the extent to which individuals preferred work environments that provided opportunities for originality, chances to get ahead in one's career, freedom from close supervision, and opportunities to learn new skills. The preference was measured against a desire to have a job that focused on working with people rather than with things, a job with prestige, a job that did not disrupt family life, and a job that provided enough money for a good living. McLeod recognized that people could desire jobs with both of these sets of orientations. Professionalism, however, according to the methodological argument, was measured by a dominance of the former motivations over the latter.

Professionalism also included a service orientation, and McLeod included in his 12-item index two items that tapped this motivation. Those who desired a job that is valuable and essential to the community and want opportunities to have an influence on the public's thinking were considered to be more professional. But this service orientation was not dominant in the index. Rather the index was of job characteristics that were associated with professional work. In this way, the work of McLeod and his students seems to have anticipated the criticism of the professional literature, namely, that what it really means to be professional is to have control over one's work environment. A social orientation is not a dominant part of this. What is important is power and control, and the McLeod and Hawley measure seems to tap this.

The dominance of one set of attitudes (deemed professional attitudes) over another (labeled nonprofessional attitudes) was crucial in the McLeod and Hawley formulation. The modifications of the measure by Nayman (1973) and Windahl and Rosengren (1978) change dramatically the concept. The approach of Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman (1975) is conceptually distinct enough as to be something quite different again. The same can be said for the Hall (1968) formulation.

McLeod never saw his measure of degree of professionalism as important in and of itself. Rather, he saw it as part of a larger theoretical framework in which degree of professionalism had antecedents and consequences. The consequences of interest were aspects of journalistic performance. Those individuals who were more professional should be better journalists.

The theoretical shortcoming of the work of McLeod and his students is that it never really advanced this argument about the consequences of degree of professionalism in a way that separates it from the larger discussion of the attitudes of journalists. Why would those people who want jobs with autonomy and opportunities for originality and initiative be more likely to behave in a more satisfactory way as journalists? To be sure, one can infer that a person who wants freedom from continual close supervision should be more likely to be critical of her or his newspaper. A person who looks for jobs that reward initiative should be a better investigator and, therefore, a better journalist. But these arguments are not fully advanced in the McLeod work.

As a consequence, many seem to have made the assumption that it was social orientation that drove the hypothesis. In other words, professionals are more socially oriented, so they should be better journalists because of their concern for the community. The very context of professional debate in journalism and elsewhere seemed to argue for this assumption.

In a sense, Kepplinger and Voll (1979), Carey (1969) and Soloski (1989), in their critical comments about professionalism, reflect the contemporary view of the profession in the sociological literature as an occupation that is much more concerned about its own power base than about service to society. But they do not negate the arguments of McLeod that professionalism as he defined it still can be related to a high level of journalistic performance.

The work of McLeod and his students does provide evidence that degree of professionalism is

tied to three important elements of the newspaper operation: to the attitudes and judgments of newsmen regarding their newspaper, to the performance of that newspaper, and to the desire to remain in newspaper work.

The McLeod work, viewed as a whole, is ambiguous or underdeveloped in a second important way. It never fully deals with or integrates the second set of measures used, namely items designed to determine if the job held meets expectations. Early in the work, McLeod used these items, in comparison with the items measuring desire, to create an index of job satisfaction. In later work, the items are simply treated as a measure of working conditions. Both have promise, yet neither has been used in a significant way in the work since McLeod withdrew from the research area.

Beam (1990) has quite correctly criticized the McLeod work for mixing levels of analysis. The original measure at the level of the journalist cannot be simply aggregated to create an organizational level concept, as McLeod and his students often did. Such measures might be part of an organizational-level measure, but they are not sufficient for a variety of reasons, not least of which is that not all journalists in an organization have equal impact on the workings of that organization.

The criticism of the use of the McLeod and Hawley items in international comparisons misses its mark, however, if professionalism is viewed more neutrally. It isn't necessarily a good thing to be a professional in and of itself, in this view, but being a professional may have positive consequences in terms of work performance.

Discussions about professionalism among mass communication workers and educators continues today at a rapid clip. Perhaps most striking is the effort by some in the occupation of public relations to wrap themselves in the professional mantle. The work of McLeod has sometimes been referenced in this dialog.

It would be unrealistic to expect that much of the scientific literature would have had impact on this discussion. Certainly the contemporary critical work in the sociological literature suggests that being a profession is not necessarily good or bad. It is simply a way of gaining power.

Yet the work of McLeod does offer some suggestions here. If being professional simply means valuing work that offers one control, autonomy and independence, there is no reason to value this more

or less highly unless it can be linked to performance. The discussion in public relations might profitably focus on this question.

In the end, the utility of the McLeod work on professionalism probably rests with more attention to the meaning of work for the individuals involved and the implications of the values represented on actual work. Perhaps the less said about social orientation the better. It may make a lot of sense to continue to view that as only a small part of a professional orientation.

Bibliography

Bibliography

Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Adams, D. & Miller, B. K. (2001). Professionalism in nursing behaviors of nurse practitioners. *Journal of Professional Nursing 17* (4), 203-210.

Becker, L. B., Fruit, J. W., & Caudill, S. L. (1987). *The training and hiring of journalists*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Beam, R. A. (1990, June). Journalism professionalism as an organizational-level concept. *Journalism and Mass Communication Monographs, 121*.

Bertrand, C. J., & Bordat, F. (1989). *Les medias americains en France*. Paris: Belin.

Bissland, J. H., & Rentner, T. L. (1989). Education's role in professionalizing public relations: A progress report. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 4* (1), 92-105.

Bobbitt, H. R., Breinholt, R. Doktor, R., & McNaul, J. (1978). *Organizational behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Braverman, H. (1975). *Labor and monopoly capital: The degradation of work in the twentieth century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Breed, W. (1955). Social control in the newsroom. *Social Forces*, *33*, 326-35.

Broom, Glen M., & Dozier, David M. (1986). Advancement for public relations role models. *Public Relations Review 12* (1), 37-56.

Cameron, G. T., Sallot, L. M., & Weaver-Lariscy, R. A. (1996). Developing standards of professional performance in public relations. *Public Relations Review*, *22*(1), 43-61.

Carey, J. W. (1969). The communications revolution and the professional communicator. In Paul Halmos (Ed.), *The sociological review monograph No. 13, sociology of mass media communicators* (pp. 23-38)*.* Keele, UK: Keele University.

Carr-Saunders, A. M., & Wilson, P. A.. (1933a). Professions. *Encyclopedia of the social sciences*, *11-12*, 476-80.

Carr-Saunders, A. M., & Wilson, P. A. (1933b). *The professions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coldwell, T. (1974). Professionalization and performance among newspaper photographers. *Gazette*, *20,* 73-81.

Day, L. J. (1968). The Latin American journalist: A tentative profile. *Journalism Quarterly, 45* (3)*,* 509-515.

Dozier, D. M. (1995). Evolution of the manager role in public relations practice. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 7*(1), 3-26.

Dozier, D. M., Grunig, L. A., & Grunig, J. E. (1995). *Manager's guide to excellence in public relations and communication management.* Mahwah, N.J. : L. Erlbaum Associates.

Durkheim, E. (1957). *Professional ethics and civic morals*. London: Routledge & Paul.

Dyer, P. M. (1977). How professional is the BSW worker. *Social Work*, *22*(6), 487-492.

Eapen, K. (1969). Journalism as a profession in India: A study of two states and two cities. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 7003518.

Freidson, E. (1970). *Profession of medicine*. New York: Dodd Mead.

Garrison, B., & Salwen, M. (1989, Fall). Professional orientations of sports journalists: A study of Associated Press sports editors. *Newspaper Research Journal*, *10* (3), 77-84.

Greenwood, J. E. (1957). Attributes of a profession. *Social Work*, *2* (3), 45-55.

Golding, P. (1977). Media professionalism in the Third World: The transfer of an ideology. In J. Curran, M. Gurevitch and J. Woollacott (Eds.), *Mass communication and society* (pp. 291-308). London: Edward Arnold.

Grunig, J E. (1992). *Excellence in public relations and communication management.* Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Grunig, J. E. (2001). Two-way symmetrical public relations: Past, present, and future. In R. Heath & G. Vasquez (Eds.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 11-30). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Haga, W. J., Graen, G., & Dansereau, F., Jr. (1974). Professionalism and role making in a service organization: A longitudinal investigation. *American Sociological Review, 39* (1), 122-133.

Hall, R. (1968). Professionalism and bureaucratization. *American Sociological Review*, *33* (1), 92-104.

Hallahan, K. E. (1974). Professional association membership, professional socialization and the professionalization of the public relations practitioner. (Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison.)

Hammer, D. P. (2000, Winter). Professional attitudes and behaviors: The "A's and B's" of professionalism. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *64*, 455-464.

Hardt, H. (2000). Conflict of interest: Newsworkers, media, and patronage journalism. In H. Tumber (Ed.), *Media power, professionals and policies* (pp 209-224). London, New York: Routledge.

Henningham, J. P. (1984). Comparison between three versions of the professional orientation index. *Journalism Quarterly*, *61* (2), 302-309.

Henningham, J. P. (1996, Spring). Australian journalists' professional and ethical values. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, *73* (1), 206-218.

Hoff, T. J. (2000). Professional commitment among US physician executives in managed care. *Social Science & Medicine, 50*, 1433-1444.

Hughes, E. (1963). Professions. *Daedalus, 92* (4), 655-668.

Idsvoog, K., & Hoyt, J. (1977, Winter). Professionalism and performance of television journalists. *Journal of Broadcasting*, *21*(1), 97-109.

Johansen, P. (2001). Professionalisation, building respectability and the birth of the Canadian public relations society. *Journalism Studies*, *2* (1): 55-71.

Johnson, T. (1972). *Professions and power*. New York: Macmillan.

Johnstone, J., Slawski, E., & Bowman, W. (1972). The professional values of American newsmen. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 36* (1), 522-540.

Kepplinger, H., & Voll, I. (1979). Mit beschrankter Haftung: Zum verantwortungsbewusstsein von Fernsehredakteuren. In H.M. Keplinger (Ed.), *Angepasste Aussenseiter: Was Journalisten denken und wie sie arbeiten* (pp. 223-260). Freiburg, Muenchen: Karl Alber.

Kramer, S. A. (1955). Appendix: The professions in the U. S. Census. In L. E. Blauch (Ed.), *Education for the profession* (pp. 292-296). Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Kreshel, P.J. (1990). The 'Culture' of J. Walter Thompson, 1915-1925. *Public Relations Review*, 16 (3), 80-93.

Larson, M. (1977). *The rise of professionalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lattimore, D., & Nayman, O. (1974). Professionalism of Colorado's daily newsmen: A communicator's analysis. *Gazette*, *20*, 1-10.

Leroy, D. (1972-73, Winter). Levels of professionalism in a sample of television newsmen. *Journal of Broadcasting*, *17*(1), 51-62.

Lieberman, M. (1956). *Education as a profession*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Linehan, B. (1970). Professional orientation of newsmen on state dailies: A Wisconsin newsmen study. (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin.)

Marvick, D.(1954). Career perspectives in a bureaucratic setting. *Michigan Governmental Studies*, 27.

Masterman, L. & Mariet, F. (1994). *Media education in 1990' Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Press.

McLeod, J. M. (1971). Research on professionalization. (Presented to the Research Committee of the Association for Education in Journalism, Columbia, SC, August).

McLeod, J. M. (2001). Personal correspondence with the first author.

McLeod, J. M., &. Hawley Jr., S. E. (1964). Professionalization among newsmen. *Journalism Quarterly*, *41* (4), 529-39.

McLeod, J. M., &. Hawley Jr., S. E. (1965). Newspaper self-image study of the Milwaukee Journal editorial staff, Milwaukee Sentinel editorial staff, Journal Company non-editorial employees. (Unpublished manuscript, Mass Communication Research Center, University of Wisconsin).

McLeod, J. M., & Rush, R. R. (1969a). Professionalization of Latin American and U.S. journalists. *Journalism Quarterly, 46* (3), 583-590.

McLeod, J. M., & Rush, R. R. (1969b). Professionalization of Latin American and U.S. journalists: Part II. *Journalism Quarterly, 46* (4), 784-789.

Menanteau-Horta, D. (1967). Professionalism of journalists in Santiago de Chile. *Journalism Quarterly 44* (4), 714-726.

Miller, K.S. (1999). Public relations in film and fiction: 1930-1995. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 11* (1), 3-28.

Montague, J. B. (1966, Spring). Professionalism among American, Australian and English physicians. *Journal of Health and Human Behavior, 7* (1), 284-289.

Nayman, O. (1971). Professional orientation of metropolitan Turkish journalist: A communicator analysis. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 31/11, 6001.

Nayman, O. (1973). Professional orientations of journalists: An introduction to communicator analysis studies. *Gazette*, *19*, 195-212.

Nayman, O., Atkin, C., & O'Keefe, G. (1973). Journalism as a profession in a developing society: Metropolitan Turkish newsmen. *Journalism Quarterly 50*, 68-76.

Nayman, O., McKee, B. K., & Lattimore, D. L. (1977). PR personnel and print journalists: A comparison of professionalism. *Journalism Quarterly, 54* (4), 492-497.

Oledsky, J.(1998). Polish journalists: Professionals or not. In D. Weaver (Ed.), *The global journalist* (pp. 277-297). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G.J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957). *The measurement of meaning.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Parsons, T. (1954)*. Essays in sociological theory*. London: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Sallot, L.M., Cameron, G. T., & Weaver-Lariscy, R. A. (1997). Professional standards in public relations: A survey of educators. *Public Relations Review, 23* (3), 197-216.

Sallot, L.M., Cameron, G. T., & Weaver-Lariscy, R. A. (1998). Pluralistic ignorance and professional standards: Underestimating professionalism of our peers in public relations. *Public Relations Review, 24* (1), 1-19.

Schwartz, D. F., Yarbrough, & J. P., & Shakra, M. T. (1992). Does public relations education make the grade? *Public Relations Journal*, *48* (9), 18-25.

Schultze, Q. J. (1981). Professionalism in advertising: The origin of ethical codes. *Journal of Communication, 31*(2), 64-71.

Serini, S. A. (1993). Influences on the power of public relations professionals in organizations: A case study. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 5* (1), 1-25.

Soloski, J. (1989). News reporting and professionalism: Some constraints on the reporting of news. *Media, Culture & Society*, *11* (2), 207-228.

Spicer, C.H. (1993). Images of public relations in print media. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *5* (1), 47-61.

Starck, K., & Sudhaker, A. (1978). Reconceptualizing the notion of journalistic professionalism across differing press systems. (Unpublished paper presented to the International Division of the Association for Education in Journalism, Seattle, WA.)

Stark, R. W. (1962). Policy and the pros: An organizational analysis of a metropolitan newspaper. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 7* (1), 11-31.

Tannenbaum, P. H., & McLeod, J. M. (1963). Public images of mass media institutions. In W. A. Danielson (Ed.), *Paul J. Deutschmann memorial papers in mass communications research* (pp. 51-60).
Cincinnati: Scripps-Howard Research.

Tunstall, J. (1971). *Journalists at work*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Wallace, J. E. (1995). Corporatist control and organizational commitment among professionals: The case of lawyers working in law firms. *Social Forces, 73* (3), 811-839.

Ward, L.S. (1966). Professionalization among advertising agency personnel. (Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Wisconsin.)

Weaver, D. H., & Wilhoit, G. C. (1991). *The American journalist. A portrait of U.S. news people and their work*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Weaver, D. H., & Wilhoit, G. C. (1996). *The American journalist in the 1990s. U.S. news people at the end of an era*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Weaver, D. H. (Ed.). (1998). *The global journalist*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Weinthal, D., & O'Keefe, G. (1974). Professionalism among broadcast newsmen in an urban area. *Journal of Broadcasting*, *18* (2), 193-209.

Weischenberg, S. (1995). *Journalistik: Theorie und Praxis aktueller Medienkommunikation, Band 2.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Windahl, S., & Rosengren, K. E.(1976). Professionalization of Swedish journalists. *Gazette, 22* (3), 140-149.

Windahl, S., &. Rosengren, K. E. (1978). Newsmen's professionalization: Some methodological problems. *Journalism Quarterly*, *55* (3), 466-473.

Wilensky, H. L. (1962). The dynamics of professionalism. The case of hospital administration. *Hospital Administration*, 7(2), 6-24.

Wilensky, H. L. (1964). The professionalization of everyone. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *70* (2), 137-158.

Wright, D. K. (1974). An analysis of the level of professionalism among Canadian journalists. *Gazette*, *20* (3), 132-144.

Wright, D. K. (1978). Professionalism and the public relations counselor: An empirical analysis. *Public Relations Quarterly*, *23* (4), 26-29.

Table 1

Desired Job Characteristics from McLeod and Hawley (1964)

Professional items

1. Full use of your abilities and training (E)
2. Opportunity for originality and initiative (E)
3. Opportunity to learn new skills and knowledge (NF)
4. Getting ahead in your professional career (A)
5. Having a job with a paper that is known and respected by journalists all over the United States (R)
6. Having a job that is valuable and essential to the community (I)
7. Respect for the ability and competence of co-workers (R)
8. Opportunity to have an influence on the public's thinking (I)
9. A supervisor who appreciates the time you spend in improving your capabilities (NF)
10. Freedom from continual close supervision over your work (R)
11. Having an influence on important decisions (I)
12. A job that makes the organization different in some ways because I work for it (I)

Non-Professional items

1. An enjoyment of what's involved in doing the job (HR)
2. Availability of support; working with people who will stand behind a man–help out in a tough spot (HR)
3. Getting ahead in the organization you work for (A)
4. Salary; earning enough money for a good living (A)
5. Working with people rather than things (HR)
6. Security of the job in its being fairly permanent (S)
7. Excitement and variety the job provides (E)
8. Being with people who are congenial and easy to work with (S)
9. Having a job with prestige in the community (P)
10. Having a prestigeful job in the organization (P)
11. A job that brings me in contact with important people, *e.g.*, community and state leaders (P)
12. A job that does not disrupt my family life (S)

Key to factor analysis of Desired Job Characteristics:
E = Expressiveness factor   HR = Human Relations factor
A = Advancement factor   P = Prestige factor
R = Respect factor   S = Security factor
I = Influence factor   NF = Item does not load on any of seven factors

Question: "People look for different things in their occupations which make their work satisfying to them. Below are some job characteristics that can be applied to most occupations. First, we would like know how important to *you* they are in any *job*. For each is it: 1) Extremely important, 2) Quite important, 3) Somewhat important or 4) Not important?"